DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 259 642 HE 018 523

AUTHOR Westphal, Nancy Jo
TITLE Toward the Study of Functional Linkages in Statewide Agencies for Higher Education. ASHE 1985 Annual Meeting Paper.
PUB DATE Mar 85
NOTE 19p.; Revision of a paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education (Chicago, IL, March 15-17, 1985).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Agency Role; *Budgeting; College Planning; Coordination; *Governing Boards; *Higher Education; Program Evaluation; Resource Allocation; *State Boards of Education; State Colleges; *Statewide Planning
IDENTIFIERS *ASHE Annual Meeting; *Public Colleges

ABSTRACT

Differences among statewide coordinating boards/agencies and consolidated governing boards/agencies in level of authority for budgeting, program review/approval, and planning for public senior institutions were studied. The potential for effective linkage or integration of these activities was also explored. Forty-five state agencies completed questionnaires, which covered the agency's type of budgetary authority (i.e., statutory, policy-based, or no involvement). Level of involvement in the budget process was measured in four ways: recommending and allocating the consolidated budget, recommending but not allocating the budget, reviewing and recommending, or no involvement. It was found that, in general, consolidated governing boards exhibited greater potential for effective linkages/integration of functional responsibilities than did coordinating boards/agencies. For both types of agencies, there did not appear to be much potential for effectively linking authority for existing program review/approval to other functional responsibilities. For each state, information is provided on whether it has a consolidated governing board, coordinating board, or 1202 Commission; as well as the name of each state's board/agency. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED259642

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Nancy Jo Westphal

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

TOWARD THE STUDY OF FUNCTIONAL LINKAGES IN STATEWIDE AGENCIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Paper presented at the 1985 Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education

Nancy Jo Westphal
University of Wisconsin-Madison
March, 1985

NE 018 523

The three primary functions of statewide agencies for higher education, both coordinating boards and consolidated governing boards, lie in the areas of budgeting, program review and approval and planning. Given the challenges that these agencies will surely face in the next several years, it becomes increasingly important for them to give attention to whether their levels of responsibility in these key areas are such as to ensure maximum effective integration or linkage of their activities.

Berdahl first wrote about the linkage or integration of these three functions in 1971, but interest in the idea that they should be treated as integrated entities has more recently served as a focus of much of the literature. However, no study to date has attempted, even on a rudimentary level, to build conceptualizations of the ways in which the existence of such linkages may be studied or to provide some measure of whether such integration or linkage is possible given board authority in these major functional areas.

The need for such linkages is readily apparent. It would be impossible for an agency to be truly effective in any one of these areas without having at least some involvement in the others. For example, it would be difficult for an agency to carry out broad responsiblities in the area of program review and approval if it had no involvement whatsoever in the budgetary process. As another example, for an agency to be empowered via statute to conduct statewide planning and coordination while having no involvement in program review and approval means that efforts in the first area will be severely hampered by lack of effective authority or involvement in the second.

For such reasons, a logical place to begin the study of effective functional integration or linkage in statewide agencies for higher education is through an examination of authority and involvement levels across functions. The major objective of this study, then, was to establish a broad understanding of structures of cross-functional responsibility levels in statewide agencies

for higher education as a first step in examining effective functional linkage. The need for such linkage is evident if agencies are to deal adequately with increasingly complex educational issues in an era of fiscal constraints and environmental instability.

The study was wholly descriptive, focusing on agency-reported responsibility levels in these functional areas and providing for analysis of the association between authority and involvement levels across functions. The analytical context of the study called for a research strategy that would provide generalized information about responsibility levels for a large number of statewide agencies for higher education. The study, then, was a comparative organizational study. As Blau (1974) stated:

> ... the comparative method in the study of organizations is ... the systematic comparison of a fairly large number of organizations in order to establish relationships between their characteristics. In short, the term is used here to refer to quantitative comparisons that make it possible to determine relationships between attributes of organizations...regardless of how impressionistic the data are on which the analysis is based. (p.111)

The methodology of survey research was chosen as an appropriate and efficient means of gathering the data needed to fulfill the objectives of this study and the larger research project of which it was a part. A self-administered, mailed questionnaire was developed as a part of the project. The population of the study was 45 statewide agencies for higher education in full operation as of December, 1982. Agencies were chosen for inclusion primarily on the basis of having statewide responsibility for public senior institutions and no more than one agency per state was included. Boards were selected after careful review of relevant literature published primarily by the Education Commission of the States, (1979, 1980, Education Commission of the States et al, 1981) and were classified as either coordinating boards or consolidated governing boards basically following the definitions of Zwingle (1970) as shown in Appendix A.

The survey instrument was sent to the chief executive officer of each of the 45 agencies. A 100% response rate was achieved. The board itself formed the unit of analysis. Board and agency are used here interchangeably to refer to both the board and its staff. Questions about responsibility of the board for operating budgets, capital budgets, review/approval of both new and existing programs, and statewide planning and coordination, all as they relate to public senior institutions on a statewide basis were included in the survey instrument and formed the basis of the data analyzed.

Respondents were asked to indicate their agency's level of involvement in operating budgets as one of four levels: 1) agency recommends consolidated budget and allocates funds 2)

agency recommends consolidated budget but funds are allocated directly to individual institutions and/or multicampus systems below the state level, 3) agency reviews individual institution and/or multicampus budgets and makes budget recommendations to the legislative/executive branches, or 4) agency has no budgetary involvement. For responsibility for the other functions, board authority was labelled as statutory or constitutional, matter of policy only, or no involvement.

In order to examine potential for effective functional linkage, levels of functional responsibility pairs were analyzed via crosstabs, controlling for agency type. Functional responsibility levels were analyzed in pairs due to the need to control for agency type and because the small size of the population precluded effective analysis of more than two variables, that is levels of functional responsibility, at a time.

Obviously, only descriptive statistics are appropriate to describe characteristics and relationships in a population as opposed to a sample. For populations, statistical measures of association sufficiently summarize the strength of the relationship between variables (Nie et al, 1975). Zero-order gamma was used to measure the association between the functional pairs alone while partial gamma was used to measure this relationship while controlling for agency type. Only absolute gamma values are presented here.

Conceptual guidelines as shown in Appendix B were utilized in analyzing the data. For operating budgets, recommending and allocating a consolidated budget or, for the other functions, statutory or constitutional authority on one function paired with an equivalent level of authority on the other function indicated a strong positive relationship and thus strong potential for functional linkage. A level of authority or involvement greater than no involvement whatsoever for one function coupled with recommending but not allocating a consolidated budget or reviewing and recommending individual campus or multicampus budgets for operating budgets or authority as a matter of policy only for the other functions signalled a moderately positive relationship and some potential for linkage. Any level of authority or involvement for one function coupled with no involvement on the other function indicated no relationship and thus no potential for functional linkage. Only highlights of the findings are discussed here although tables for all of the relationships examined are included at the end of the paper.

The relationship between operating budget responsibility and new program review and approval responsibility is presented on Table 7. Here we see that most statewide agencies exhibit at least a moderate relationship between levels of authority for the two functions. However, 2 coordinating boards have no involvement in the operating budget process but do have statutory or constitutional authority for new program review and approval while two others have no involvement in either function. The partial gamma of .71 indicates a strong relationship between

distribution on these two variables when the type of agency is taken into account, reflecting the generally higher levels of responsibility over both functions reported by consolidated governing boards.

Although almost all agencies show some relationship between, and thus some potential for integration of, operating budget responsibility and new program review and approval responsibility, the same is not true for the relationship between operating budget responsibility and existing program review and approval. The relationship between responsibility levels for operating budgets and existing program review and approval is shown on Table 8. 11 coordinating boards and 3 consolidated governing boards show no relationship between responsibility levels for these two functions. Note, for example, 2 coordinating boards that recommend and allocate a consolidated budget but have no authority for existing program review and approval. Also, there are 2 coordinating boards with no budgetary involvement which are vested with statutory authority for existing program review and approval. The low gamma values reflect the generally lower levels of association between these two functional variables on the part of both types of agencies. This lower level of association is most directly tied to the relatively lower levels of authority over existing program review and approval reported by both types of agencies. This pattern was also evident when the relationship between responsibility levels for new and existing program review and approval were examined in conjunction with authority for capital budgets and authority for statewide planning and coordination. (See Tables 10, 11, 14, and 15.)

The relationship between authority for capital budgets and statewide planning and coordination for public senior institutions, as seen on Table 12, is strong when agency type is controlled for as reflected by the partial gamma of .83. A majority of both coordinating boards and consolidated governing boards have statutory or constitutional authority over these two functions. All consolidated governing boards/agencies exhibit at least a moderate relationship between authority levels as do 15 coordinating boards.

While the majority of agencies show potential for the effective linkage of new and existing program review and approval responsibilities as seen on Table 13, there are 9 coordinating boards and 3 consolidated governing boards that exhibit no relationship and thus no potential for effective functional integration or linkage at the statewide level. This is again due to the relatively great variability among agencies in the level of authority for existing program review/approval. For example, there are 7 coordinating boards and 2 consolidated governing boards that have statutory or constitutional authority for review of new programs but no involvement in review and approval of existing programs. There is a strong relationship between distribution along these two variables as reflected by the zero-order gamma of .79 and a very strong distributional

association when agency type is controlled for as evidenced by the partial gamma of .90. These gamma values are indicative primarily of the generally high level of authority for new program review and approval reported by both types of boards as well as the differentiation between board types relating to authority for both new and existing program review and approval.

Three primary findings emerged from this exploratory analysis. First, the majority of both types of boards show a coherent pattern of cross-functional responsibility. Second, consolidated governing boards, as a group, exhibit greater potential for effective linkage or integration of functional responsibilities as measured here than do coordinating boards as a group. It seems then that the consolidated governing board structure may hold the most promise as a means of providing for an integrated approach to the management of public senior institutions on a statewide basis. It is of course necessary to weigh this advantage against the limitations of such an agency in considering the needs of the public junior and private sectors of higher education in some states and to be perceived as an impartial evaluator, rather than an advocate, of institutions.

The third main finding is that both types of agencies, as groups, exhibit the least potential for effectively linking their authority for existing program review and approval to other functional responsiblities. The relatively lower potential exhibited by both types of agencies in relationship to linkage or integration of this function with other functional responsibilities is a reflection of the generally lower level of authority statewide agencies for higher education hold for existing program review and approval activities. The current emphasis on the necessity for careful review of programs already in operation is a direct outgrowth of current and anticipated environmental and fiscal constraints. Undoubtedly, then, this is an area in which future efforts on the part of both types of statewide agencies for higher education will be directed. Results of this study indicate that consolidated governing boards may be more able to effectively integrate their responsibilities in the area with other functional activities, at least for public senior institutions. Study results in general point to the need for agencies to give careful consideration to the role of existing program review/approval activities within the context of related functional responsiblities.

Functional integration is obviously a complex issue, fraught with difficulties for the researcher seeking both to understand and to formulate strategies for studying its existence and operation, either in one agency or within an agency type. Given the lack of past research on the subject, strategies and conceptualizations utilized in this study were necessarily general. The study has provided for an initial conceptualization and examination of the potential for functional linkage through examination of cross-functional authority and involvement levels.

Future studies will need to examine individual statewide board activities in these functional areas in detail since this

is of primary importance in determining real potential for effective linkage within a single agency. Future studies will also need to consider the political and interpersonal contexts within which such boards and their staffs necessarily operate. Such studies will need to consider the question of functional integration through innovative and appropriate combinations of qualitative and quantitative methods.

REFERENCES

Berdahl, R.O. (1971). Statewide Coordination of Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: American Council on Education.

Blau, P.M. (1974). On the Nature of Organizations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Education Commission of the States. (1979). Survey of the Structure of State Coordinating or Governing Boards and Public Institutional and Multicampus Governing Boards of Postsecondary Education. Higher Education in the States, 7, (5), 257-316.

Education Commission of the States. (1980). Challenge: Coordination and Governance in the 80s. (Report No. 134). Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States. Reprinted in ASHE Reader in Organization and Governance in Higher Education (R. Birnbaum, Ed.), Lexington, MA: Ginn Custom Publishing, 319-354.

Education Commission of the States, National Center for Higher Education Management Systems, State Higher Education Executive Officers Association. (1981). State Postsecondary Profiles Handbook, 1981 Edition. Denver, CO: Education Commission of the States.

Nie, N.H., Hull, C.H., Jenkins, J.G., Steinbrenner, K. and Bent, D.H. (1975). SPSS: Statistical Package for the Social Sciences. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Zwingle, J.L. (1970). State Boards for Higher Education. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Department of Health, Education, and Welfare.

APPENDIX A

STATEWIDE AGENCIES FOR HIGHER EDUCATION

Consolidated governing board	Coordinating board	1202 Commission Only No other statewide agency
Alaska[1]	Alabama	Delaware
Arizona*	Arkansas	Vermont
Florida[2]	California	Wyoming[10]
Georgia	Colorado	
Hawaii	Illinois	
Idaho[3]	Indiana	
Iowa*	Kentucky	
Kansas*	Louisiana	
Maine[4]	Maryland	
Massachusetts	Michigan	
Mississippi*	Minnesota	
Montana[5]	Missouri	
Nevada	Nebraska	
New Hampshire[6]	New Jersey	
North Carolina*	New Mexico	States undergoing restructuring of statewide agency for higher education at the time of the study
North Dakota	New York[9]	
Oregon [7]	Ohio	
Rhode Island	Oklahoma	Connecticut
South Dakota[8]	South Carolina	Pennsylvania
Utah	Tennessee	
West Virginia	Texas	
Wisconsin	Virginia	
	Washington	

APPENDIX B

CONCEPTUAL GUIDELINES

REC AND ALLOC CONSOLIDATED BUDGET STATUTORY OR CONST AUTHORITY	STATUTORY OR CONST AUTHORITY REC AND ALLOC CONSOLIDATED BUDGET	STRONG POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP, STRONG POTENTIAL FOR LINKAGE
REC AND ALLOC CONSOLIDATED BUDGET REC CONSOLIDATED BUDGET, NO ALLOC REVIEW AND REC CAMPUS BUDGETS STATUTORY OR CONST AUTHORITY AUTHORITY AS MATTER OF POLICY ONLY	AUTHORITY AS MATTER OF POLICY ONLY REC CONSOLIDATED BUDGET, NO ALLOC REVIEW AND REC CAMPUS BUDGETS	MODERATELY POSITIVE RELATIONSHIP, SOME POTENTIAL FOR LINKAGE
REC AND ALLOC CONSOLIDATED BUDGET REC CONSOLIDATED BUDGET, NO ALLOC REVIEW AND REC CAMPUS BUDGETS STATUTORY OR CONST AUTHORITY AUTHORITY AS MATTER OF POLICY ONLY NO INVOLVEMENT	NO INVOLVEMENT	NO RELATIONSHIP, NO POTENTIAL FOR LINKAGE

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Tables 1-5 were removed by the author
from this revised edition.

TABLE 6

Operating Budget Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions by Capital Budget Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

	Operating Budget Responsibility							
	Coordinating				Governing			
Capital Budget Respon.	Recommend and allocate	Recommend but do not allocate	Review and recom.	No invol.	Recommend and allocate	Recommend but do not allocate	Review and recom.	No invol.
Statutory or const.	3	6	6	0	10	3	7	0
Matter of policy only	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0
No invol.	0	1	1	4	0	0	0	0

Zero-order gamma: |.61|

Partial gamma: |.56|

Cases missing: 2

TABLE 7

Operating Budget Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions by Review/Approval Responsibility for New Programs for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

New Program Review/ Approval	Operating Budget Responsibility: Coordinating — Recommend and allocate	Coordinating — Recommend but do not allocate	Coordinating — Review and recommend	Coordinating — No involv.	Governing — Recommend and allocate	Governing — Recommend but do not allocate	Governing — Review and recommend	Governing — No involv.
Statutory or const.	3	7	8	2	11	2	6	0
Matter of policy only	0	0	0	0	0	2	1	0
No involv.	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	0

Zero-order gamma: |.59|

Partial gamma: |.71|

Cases missing: 1

TABLE 8

Operating Budget Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions by Review/Approval Responsibility for Existing Programs for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

Existing Program Review/ Approval	Operating Budget Responsibility: Coordinating — Recommend and allocate	Coordinating — Recommend but do not allocate	Coordinating — Review and recommend	Coordinating — No involv.	Governing — Recommend and allocate	Governing — Recommend but do not allocate	Governing — Review and recommend	Governing — No involv.
Statutory or const.	1	4	5	2	9	2	4	0
Matter of policy only	0	1	0	0	1	1	2	0
No involv.	2	2	3	2	1	1	1	0

Zero-order gamma: |.18|

Partial gamma: |.12|

Cases missing: 1

TABLE 9

Operating Budget Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions by Statewide Planning and Coordination Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

	Operating Budget Responsibility							
	Coordinating				Governing			
Statewide Planning & Coord.	Recommend and allocate	Recommend but do not allocate	Review and recommend	No involv.	Recommend and allocate	Recommend but do not allocate	Review and recommend	No involv
Statutory or const.	3	7	7	3	10	3	5	0
Matter of policy only	0	0	0	0	1	1	2	0
No involv.	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0

Zero-order gamma: |.36|

Partial gamma: |.60|

Cases missing: 2

TABLE 10

Capital Budget Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions by Review/Approval Responsibility for New Programs for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

New Program Review/ Approval	Capital Budget Responsibility					
	Coordinating			Governing		
	Statutory or constitu-tional	Matter of policy only	No involv.	Statutory or constitu-tional	Matter of policy only	No involv.
Statutory or const.	15	0	5	18	1	0
Matter of policy only	0	0	0	2	1	0
No involv.	0	0	2	0	0	0

Zero-order gamma: |.73|

Partial gamma: |.92|

Cases missing: 1

TABLE 11

Capital Budget Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions by Review/Approval Responsibility for Existing Programs for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

Existing Program Review/ Approval	Capital Budget Responsibility					
	Coordinating			Governing		
	Statutory or constitu-tional	Matter of policy only	No involv.	Statutory or constitu-tional	Matter of policy only	No involv.
Statutory or const.	9	0	4	14	1	0
Matter of policy only	1	0	0	3	1	0
No involv.	5	0	3	3	0	0

Zero-order gamma: |.21|

Partial gamma: |.14|

Cases missing: 1

TABLE 12

Capital Budget Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions by Statewide Planning and Coordination Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

Statewide Planning and Coord.	Capital Budget Responsibility: Coordinating: Statutory or constitutional	Coordinating: Matter of policy only	Coordinating: No involv.	Governing: Statutory or constitutional	Governing: Matter of policy only	Governing: No involv.
Statutory or const.	15	0	6	17	1	0
Matter of policy only	0	0	0	3	1	0
No involv.	0	0	1	0	0	0

Zero-order gamma: |.44|

Partial gamma: |.83|

Cases missing: 1

TABLE 13

Review/Approval Responsibility for New Programs for Public Senior Institutions by Review/Approval Responsibility for Existing Programs for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

Existing Program Review/ Approval	New Program Review/Approval					
	Coordinating			Governing		
	Statutory or constitu-tional	Matter of policy only	No involv.	Statutory or constitu-tional	Matter of policy only	No involv.
Statutory or const.	13	0	0	15	0	0
Matter of policy only	1	0	0	2	2	0
No involv.	7	0	2	2	1	0

Zero-order gamma: |.79|

Partial gamma: |.90|

Cases missing: 0

TABLE 14

Review/Approval Responsibility for New Programs for Public Senior Institutions by Statewide Planning and Coordination Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

Statewide Planning and Coord.	New Program Review/Approval: Coordinating — Statutory or constitutional	Coordinating — Matter of policy only	Coordinating — No involv.	Governing — Statutory or constitutional	Governing — Matter of policy only	Governing — No involv.
Statutory or const.	20	0	1	17	1	0
Matter of policy only	0	0	0	2	2	0
No involv.	0	0	1	0	0	0

Zero-order gamma: |.90|

Partial gamma: |.93|

Cases missing: 1

TABLE 15

Review/Approval Responsibility for Existing Programs for Public Senior Institutions by Statewide Planning and Coordination Responsibility for Public Senior Institutions Controlling for Agency Type

Statewide Planning and Coord.	Existing Program Review/Approval: Coordinating — Statutory or constitutional	Coordinating — Matter of policy only	Coordinating — No involv.	Governing — Statutory or constitutional	Governing — Matter of policy only	Governing — No involv.
Statutory or const.	13	1	7	14	2	2
Matter of policy only	0	0	0	1	2	1
No involv.	0	0	1	0	0	0

Zero-order gamma: |.59|

Partial gamma: |.76|

Cases missing: 1

ASHE Association for the Study of Higher Education
The George Washington University/One Dupont Circle, Suite 630/Washington, D.C. 20036
(202) 296-2597

This paper was presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for the Study of Higher Education held at the Palmer House Hotel in Chicago, Illinois, March 15-17, 1985. This paper was reviewed by ASHE and was judged to be of high quality and of interest to others concerned with the research of higher education. It has therefore been selected to be included in the ERIC collection of ASHE conference papers.